



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/749,967

12/28/2000

Larry D. Woodring

BELL-0026/99190

6937

23377

7590

02/18/2004

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
ONE LIBERTY PLACE, 46TH FLOOR
1650 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

BARNIE, REXFORD N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/749,967

Applicant(s)

WOODRING, LARRY D.

Examiner

REXFORD N BARNIE

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-13, 15-20 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-13, 15-20 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

R. Barnie
REXFORD BARNIE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kay et al. (US Pat# 5,254,571) in view of Roberts et al. (US Pat# 6,208,854)) and further in view of Shaffer et al. (US Pat# 6,252,953).

Regarding claim 1, Kay et al. teaches a system for managing within a telephone network comprising of a plurality of SSP to which a caller calling a business can be connected as well as an agent working on behalf of a business in (see fig. 1). Kay teaches a SCP which can keep records of work at home agent information, billing information and routing data in (see col. 18 line 41-col. 19). Furthermore, assuming a caller is connected to a SSP associated with a business, the call is intercepted at the SSP and then the SCP is queried for call routing information at which point, the call can be forwarded to an agent working at home by using well known call forwarding techniques in (see col. 19). When an agent working at home on behalf of a business makes a call, it is noted and then billed to the business according to Kay. Kay teaches being able to provide such a service based on an originating telephone number (ANI) and the DN (dialed number) in (see col. 18 lines 59-68).

Kay fails to teach providing a distinctive ringing when a call is forwarded from one telephone to another using a SCP.

Roberts teaches a cal forwarding system wherein a call can be forwarded from one telephone to another telephone based on service logic information provided by a SCP, which would be queried by a SSP in (see fig. 4, col. 3). Furthermore, according to (see col. 5), a distinctive ringing signal can be sent by a switch as part of call processing logic to alert a user of an important incoming call or special call to a call destination.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Roberts into that of Kay thus making it possible to alert a user of an incoming call which has been forwarded from a first telephone to the second telephone in order to make a determination whether to answer the call or not.

The combination including Roberts even though renders obvious the subject matter of associating distinctive ringing with call forwarding, it does not teach being able to provide distinctive ringing in a work at home environment.

Shaffer teaches a work at home system wherein according to in (see col. 2 lines 56-60), a SCP would be a network based computerized database to provide advanced intelligent services, contains service logic and associated data for services.

Furthermore, Shaffer teaches that features including call forwarding wherein a call can be routed from one station to another can be used and distinctive ringing can be provided to alert a destination terminal of an incoming calls (see col. 3 lines 17-33), a

special call. The services including call forwarding, call waiting and distinctive call ringing would be implemented based on service logic stored in the SCP.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Shaffer into that of the combination thus making it possible to alert called destination terminals of a special incoming calls in environments such as work at home which could be used by the called party to make a determination whether to answer a call or not.

Regarding claims 2-9, The combination teaches being able to route calls or to forward them to an agent and if a call is made by an agent on behalf of a business/corporation, billing the business entity for the call based on information stored in a database of a SCP in (see col. 18 lines 41-col. 19 of Kay and col. 1 lines 56-col. 2 line 6, col. 3, col. 5 of Shaffer).

Regarding claim 11, the combination including Roberts teaches providing distinctive ringing with call forwarding of calls in (see col. 5 of Roberts).

Regarding claims 12 and 13, Kay et al. teaches a system for managing within a telephone network comprising of a plurality of SSP to which a caller calling a business can be connected as well as an agent working on behalf of a business in (see fig. 1). Kay teaches a SCP which can keep records of work at home agent information, billing information and routing data in (see col. 18 line 41-col. 19). Furthermore, assuming a caller is connected to a SSP associated with a business, the call is intercepted at the SSP and then the SCP is queried for call routing information at which point, the call can be forwarded to an agent working at home by using well known call forwarding

techniques in (see col. 19). When an agent working at home on behalf of a business makes a call, it is noted and then billed to the business according to Kay. Kay teaches being able to provide such a service based on an originating telephone number (ANI) and the DN (dialed number) in (see col. 18 lines 59-68).

Kay fails to teach providing a distinctive ringing when a call is forwarded from one telephone to another using a SCP.

Roberts teaches a call forwarding system wherein a call can be forwarded from one telephone to another telephone based on service logic information provided by a SCP, which would be queried by a SSP in (see fig. 4, col. 3). Furthermore, according to (see col. 5), a distinctive ringing signal can be sent by a switch as part of call processing logic to alert a user of an important incoming call or special call to a call destination.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Roberts into that of Kay thus making it possible to alert a user of an incoming call which has been forwarded from a first telephone to the second telephone in order to make a determination whether to answer the call or not.

The combination including Roberts even though renders obvious the subject matter of associating distinctive ringing with call forwarding, it does not teach being able to provide distinctive ringing in a work at home environment, note that this limitation is not directed to the claimed subject matter but based on the specification.

Shaffer teaches a work at home system wherein according to in (see col. 2 lines 56-60), a SCP would be a network based computerized database to provide advanced

intelligent services, contains service logic and associated data for services.

Furthermore, Shaffer teaches that features including call forwarding wherein a call can be routed from one station to another can be used and distinctive ringing can be provided to alert a destination terminal of an incoming calls (see col. 3 lines 17-33), a special call. The services including call forwarding, call waiting and distinctive call ringing would be implemented based on service logic stored in the SCP.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Shaffer into that of the combination thus making it possible to alert called destination terminals of a special incoming calls in environments such as work at home which could be used by the called party to make a determination whether to answer a call or not.

Regarding claims 15-16, The combination teaches being able to forward calls to an agent working on behalf of an organization using known techniques which based on the combination would be routing a call originally directed to a first telephone to a second telephone.

Regarding claims 17-20, the combination teaches being able to route calls to or forward them to an agent and if the call is made on behalf of a business for instance, the business can be charged for such calls and if not, the calls can be process in conventional sense meaning a caller (agent) can be charge for such calls if they are toll calls in (see Kay or Shaffer).

Regarding claim 22, Kay et al. teaches a system for managing within a telephone network comprising of a plurality of SSP to which a caller calling a business can be

Art Unit: 2643

connected as well as an agent working on behalf of a business in (see fig. 1). Kay teaches a SCP which can keep records of work at home agent information, billing information and routing data in (see col. 18 line 41-col. 19). Furthermore, assuming a caller is connected to a SSP associated with a business, the call is intercepted at the SSP and then the SCP is queried for call routing information at which point, the call can be forwarded to an agent working at home by using well known call forwarding techniques in (see col. 19). When an agent working at home on behalf of a business makes a call, it is noted and then billed to the business according to Kay. Kay teaches being able to provide such a service based on an originating telephone number (ANI) and the DN (dialed number) in (see col. 18 lines 59-68).

Kay fails to teach providing a distinctive ringing when a call is forwarded from one telephone to another using a SCP.

Roberts teaches a call forwarding system wherein a call can be forwarded from one telephone to another telephone based on service logic information provided by a SCP, which would be queried by a SSP in (see fig. 4, col. 3). Furthermore, according to (see col. 5), a distinctive ringing signal can be sent by a switch as part of call processing logic to alert a user of an important incoming call or special call to a call destination.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Roberts into that of Kay thus making it possible to alert a user of an incoming call which has been forwarded from a first telephone to the second telephone in order to make a determination whether to answer the call or not.

The combination including Roberts even though renders obvious the subject matter of associating distinctive ringing with call forwarding, it does not teach being able to provide distinctive ringing in a work at home environment, note that this limitation is not directed to the claimed subject matter but based on the specification.

Shaffer teaches a work at home system wherein according to in (see col. 2 lines 56-60), a SCP would be a network based computerized database to provide advanced intelligent services, contains service logic and associated data for services. Furthermore, Shaffer teaches that features including call forwarding wherein a call can be routed from one station to another can be used and distinctive ringing can be provided to alert a destination terminal of an incoming calls (see col. 3 lines 17-33), a special call. The services including call forwarding, call waiting and distinctive call ringing would be implemented based on service logic stored in the SCP.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Shaffer into that of the combination thus making it possible to alert called destination terminals of a special incoming calls in environments such as work at home which could be used by the called party to make a determination whether to answer a call or not.

Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kay et al. (US Pat# 5,254,571) in view of Roberts et al. (US Pat# 6,208,854)} and further in view of Gruchala et al. (US Pat# 6,252,953).

Regarding claims 1, 12 and 13, Kay et al. teaches a system for managing within a telephone network comprising of a plurality of SSP to which a caller calling a business can be connected as well as an agent working on behalf of a business in (see fig. 1). Kay teaches a SCP which can keep records of work at home agent information, billing information and routing data in (see col. 18 line 41-col. 19). Furthermore, assuming a caller is connected to a SSP associated with a business, the call is intercepted at the SSP and then the SCP is queried for call routing information at which point, the call can be forwarded to an agent working at home by using well known call forwarding techniques in (see col. 19). When an agent working at home on behalf of a business makes a call, it is noted and then billed to the business according to Kay. Kay teaches being able to provide such a service based on an originating telephone number (ANI) and the DN (dialed number) in (see col. 18 lines 59-68).

Kay fails to teach providing a distinctive ringing when a call is forwarded from one telephone to another using a SCP.

Roberts teaches a call forwarding system wherein a call can be forwarded from one telephone to another telephone based on service logic information provided by a SCP, which would be queried by a SSP in (see fig. 4, col. 3). Furthermore, according to (see col. 5), a distinctive ringing signal can be sent by a switch as part of call processing logic to alert a user of an important incoming call or special call to a call destination.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Roberts into that of Kay thus making it possible to alert a user of an incoming call which has been forwarded from a first telephone to the second telephone in order to make a determination whether to answer the call or not in any environment including a work at home.

The combination including Roberts even though renders obvious the subject matter of associating distinctive ringing with call forwarding, it does not teach being able to provide distinctive ringing in a work at home environment, note that this limitation is not directed to the claimed subject matter but based on the specification.

Gruchala teaches a method and system for providing work at home telecommunication service wherein a distinctive ringing can be sent to a destination terminal as a notification signal for a work at home incoming call in (see col. 3-4, col. 10, fig. 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Roberts into that of Kay thus making it possible to alert a user of an incoming call which has been forwarded from a first telephone to the second telephone in order to make a determination whether to answer the call or not in any environment including a work at home.

Regarding claims 2-9, The combination teaches being able to route calls or to forward them to an agent and if a call is made by an agent on behalf of a business/corporation, billing the business entity for the call based on information stored

Art Unit: 2643

in a database of a SCP in (see col. 18 lines 41-col. 19 of Kay and col. 3-4, col. 10, fig. 2 of Gruchala).

Regarding claim 11, the combination including Roberts teaches providing distinctive ringing with call forwarding of calls in (see col. 5 of Roberts).

Regarding claims 15-16, The combination teaches being able to forward calls to an agent working on behalf of an organization using known techniques which based on the combination would be routing a call originally directed to a first telephone to a second telephone.

Regarding claims 17-20, the combination teaches being able to route calls to or forward them to an agent and if the call is made on behalf of a business for instance, the business can be charged for such calls and if not, the calls can be process in conventional sense meaning a caller (agent) can be charge for such calls if they are toll calls in (see Kay or Gruchala).

Regarding claim 22, see the explanation as set forth regarding claim 1 because the apparatus would perform the method steps.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-20 and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Duran (US Pat# 6,6067,456) teaches providing call forwarding in conjunction with distinctive ringing in (see col. 4 lines 51-61).

Kung et al. (US Pat# 6,6687,360) call forwarding in conjunction with distinctive ringing based on statement BRG can generate a distinctive ringing tone on the forwarded phone to notify the subscriber that the call is a forwarded call and not a call originally directed to the forwarded phone.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **REXFORD N BARNIE** whose telephone number is (703) 306-2744. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CURTIS KUNTZ can be reached on (703) 305-4708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PRIMARY EXAMINER
REXFORD BARNIE
02/11/04


REXFORD BARNIE
PRIMARY EXAMINER